REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, tentatively rejected all claims 1-32. In response, Applicant submits the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Bell Labs technical Journal, Volume 8, Issue 1, Pages 27-42. In response, claims 1-3, 6, 13-18, 20-21, and 29-32 are amended, and claim 5 is cancelled.

Amendment to FIG. 4b

A minor amendment is made to FIG. 4b, in which the lead lines associated with reference numbers 41 and 42 are changed, and reference numbers 40 and 43 are added (with associated lead lines). These changes are embodied in the accompanying replacement sheet.

Response To Objections/Rejections

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Bell Lab. journal (*Bell Labs technical Journal, Volume 8, Issue 1, Pages 27-42.*). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that the reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements and limitations. In this regard, amended claim 1 recites:

> 1.   A triggering method for IP multimedia service control, comprising the steps of:
> *recording a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) request message received by a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF)*,
> examining a corresponding SIP response message received by the S-CSCF according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC), comprising

15

specific responses triggering individual application services available from a service provider; and

re-issuing the SIP request message to an application server designated by the rFC if the corresponding SIP response message matches Service Point Triggers (SPTs) of one of the rFC.

(*Emphasis added*). Claim 1 defines over the cited art at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

As reflected above, claim 1 teaches a filtering mechanism by examining the ***corresponding SIP response message*** according to the ***response Filter Criteria***, whereas the Bell Lab Journal teaches away the filtering method by specifically instructing "The filtering is done on ***SIP request messages*** such as REGISTER, INVITE, SUBSCRIBE, or BYE, but ***not on responses to request***"(see page 32, column 1, lines 39-41). Thus, the Bell Lab journal fails to disclose, teach, or imply at least the limitation of "examining a corresponding ***SIP response message*** received by the S-CSCF according to a set of ***rFC***," as expressly defined in claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 1 further defines examining the corresponding SIP response message according to a rFC by the ***Serving Call Session Control Function; and re-issuing the SIP request message to*** an application server designated by the rFC if the corresponding SIP response message matches Service Point Triggers (SPTs) of one of the rFC. In contrast, the Bell Lab Journal teaches "the selected ***application server*** use service triggering point to apply service logic." (see Page 33, Column 1, lines 23-25). Consequently, the Bell Lab Journal does not teach disclose, teach, or imply the limitation of using ***Serving Call Session Control Function*** to carry out the triggering

16

method. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Further still, the Serving Call Session Control Function(S-CSCF) defined in claim 1 receives and checks the corresponding SIP response message, and forwards the SIP request message to the application server designated by the rFC if the corresponding SIP response message matches Service Point Triggers (SPTs) of one of the rFC, reducing the workload of the application server and network bandwidth usage, decreasing the number of unnecessary SIP message relays, and increasing the efficiency of session call establishment. Thus, the embodiments defined in claim 1 offer a more efficient triggering method for IP multimedia service control in comparison to the citation and the conventional approaches in the prior art.

In summary, the Bell Lab Journal fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "examining a corresponding ***SIP response message*** received by the ***S-CSCF*** according to a set of ***rFC***". Accordingly, the method disclosed in the cited reference is different from the embodiment defined by claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 17, claim 17 defines features that are similar to the defining features of claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn for the same reasons as claim 1, set forth above. As claims 2-16 depend from claim 1 and claims 18-32 depend from claim 17, the rejections of those claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Should the Examiner believe that a teleconference would be helpful to expedite the examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel R. McClure/

By: _____

Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
600 Galleria Pkwy, SE
Suite 1500
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500